REMARKS

Reconsideration of the obviousness rejection is requested because the cited references do not disclose (i) separate game images for each of the game players, and (ii) appending tags to game control commands to distinguish players.

Regarding element (i), the Office Action cites Rutkowski, col. 2, lines 38-39. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited material merely states that "multiplexing allows an unlimited number of controllers to be used with the same console," but says nothing about *separate game images for each of the game players*. In fact, a review of Rutkowski reveals that is entirely silent regarding *separate game images*. Further, Licht is also silent regarding this element. Therefore, the references fail to disclose or suggest element (i), and the rejection is thus improper.

Turning to element (ii), the Office Action admits that Rutkowski fails to disclose this element, and instead asserts that it is disclosed by Licht. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the specification makes clear that the claim term "tag" refers to a data element, and not to a physical device. In contrast, as used in Licht, the term "tag" refers to a physical device. For example, paragraph [0004] refers to a "RFID chip set or tag," thus equating the term "tag" to a "RFID chip set." Further, paragraph [0018] describes Figure 2 as showing that the "RFID chip set 15 is mounted to an integrated circuit on the circuit board 11 of the programmable controller." Therefore, it is clear that the "tag" (i.e., a physical device) is not equivalent to the claimed *tags* (i.e., data elements appended to game commands). In addition, nothing else in Licht teaches appending tags to commands.

Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, that Licht somehow teaches *tags* as claimed, it fails to also disclose that such tags are appended to game control commands. In fact, Licht says nothing whatsoever about any sort of game or player. Thus, it is clear that Licht cannot possibly disclose appending tags to game control commands to distinguish players. Therefore, the references also fail to disclose or suggest element (ii), and the rejection is thus improper.

In addition, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to provide a sufficient rationale for combining Rutkowski and Licht in the proposed manner. Specifically, in an obviousness rejection, "[w]here the teachings of two or more prior art references conflict, the examiner must weigh the power of each reference." MPEP 2143.01.II. Further, "[i]f the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention

being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious." MPEP 2143.01.VI. In this case, as admitted by the Office Action, Rutkowski teaches the use of different frequencies to "determine which controller is sending which control signals." See Office Action, p. 3 (citing Rutkowski, col. 3, lines 18-25). Thus, Rutkowski clearly teaches an entirely different principle of operation (i.e., using different frequencies) than that required by the claims (i.e., tagging game control commands). Accordingly, the proposed modification would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, and is therefore improper under MPEP 2143.01.VI. Further, the Office Action also fails to weigh the power of these conflicting teachings, and is thus improper under MPEP 2143.01.II.

Based on the above, reconsideration of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2012

/John C. Garza/

John C. Garza, Reg. No. 67,329
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation